PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the NTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHO	ORITY		_ ~	
To: MARIA A. TREVISAN WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACK P.C 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE		PCT WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY		
			(PCT Rule 43bis.1)	
		Date of mailing	28 FE3 20 05	
		(day/month/year) FOR FURTHE)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference		TORTORILL	See paragraph 2 below	
B0877.70027	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
International application No.			29 January 2004 (29.01.2004)	
PCT/US04/15443 International Patent Classification (IPC)	or both national classifica	tion and IPC		
International Patent Classification (20)	A61M 5/00: C12N 5/00	, 5/06, 5/08 and U	S C1.: 623/1.1, 1.42, 11.11, 23.75; 424/422,	
IPC(7): A61F 2/06, 2/00, 2/02, 13/00, 93.1, 93.7; 435/325, 366; 604/27	A01M 5/00, 0121			
Applicant				
BROWN UNIVERSITY				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	lating to the following ite	ms:	initials	
1. This opinion contains indications re	fatting to the following no	1	Confirmation	
Box No. I Basis of th	e opinion	ļ c	Docketing	
Box No. II Priority			05/28/05	
Box No. III Non-estab	lishment of opinion with r	egard to novelty, in	nventive step and industrial applicability	
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention				
Day No V Reasoned	statement under Rule 43bity; citations and explanati	is.1(a)(i) with regations supporting suc	rd to novelty, inventive step or industrial h statement	
Box No. VI Certain do	ocuments cited		DOCKETED	
Box No. VII Certain de	efects in the international			
Box No. VIII Certain ol	bservations on the internat	tional application	Mileton and the second of the	
2. FURTHER ACTION		•	in a set the	
If a demand for international prel	ning Authority (IPEA)	n IPEA has notifie	will be considered to be a written opinion of the loes not apply where the applicant chooses and the International Bureau under Rule 66. lbis(b) onsidered.	
IPEA a written reply together, mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or	before the expiration of 2	ritten opinion of the amendments, before 22 months from the	the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the re the expiration of 3 months from the date of a priority date, whichever expires later.	
For further options, see Form PC	T/ISA/220.			
3. For further details, see notes to F	orm PCT/ISA/220.			
Name and mailing address of the ISA/	US	Authorized o	DEBORAH A. THOMAS	
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents	Michael Wityshyn PARALEGAL SPECIALI		ityshyn PARALEGAL SPECIALIST	
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-145	50	Telephone No. 571-272-1600 Pint		
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	·			
Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January	ary 2004)			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/US04/15443

INTERNATIONAL SEARCHMO TO THE
Box No. I Basis of this opinion
 With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item. This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
b. format of material in written format in computer readable form
c. time of filing/furnishing contained in international application as filed. filed together with the international application in computer readable form. furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been former to additional copies is identical to that in
 In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence fishing and of the filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished. 4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US04/15443

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Run applicability; citations and expla	e 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or inventive step or inventions supporting such statement	
. Statement		
	Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 15-26, 31-41, 43	YES
Novelty (N)	Claims 2, 11, 13-14, 27-30, 42	NO
	22 22 22 21 22 41 43	_YES
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 8, 18-20, 25-26, 31-38, 41, 43 Claims 1-7, 9-17, 21, 22-24, 27-30, 39-40, 42	NO
		YES
Industrial applicability (1A)	Claims 1-43	NO
	Claims NONE	
2. Citations and explanations:		
Please See Continuation Sheet		
	•	
i		

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY	PCT/US04/15443	*
Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application		
The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted: Claim 36 is objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(iii) as containing the following defect(s) in the form or contents thereof: Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Multiple Sclerosis should be written out completely instead of using the abbreviations.		
		٠

IAP5 Rec'd PCT/PTO 27 JUL 2006

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US04/15443

10/587884

	lemental	Dav
NIIDD	iementai	DUA

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Claims 2, 11, 13-14, 27-30 and 42 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Murayama et al (Exp Hematol, 2002).

Murayama et al teach a method of isolating progenitor cells from a subject, comprising implanting a Matrigel plug containing FGF-2 and heparin into mice that had undergone bone marrow transplants. The Matrigel plugs were injected subcutaneously near the abdominal midline, where it solidified to form a hydrogel. The implants were removed seven days after injection and were examined to show CD34+ endothelial progenitor cells of donor origin had adhered to and incorporated in the implants.

Claims 1-7, 9-17, 21-24, 27-30, 39-40 and 42 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Murayama et al (Exp Hematol, 2002) in view of Naughton et al (US 2003/0007654 A1), further in view of Nova et al (US Patent 6,340,588).

Murayama et al teach a method of isolating progenitor cells from a subject, comprising implanting a Matrigel plug containing FGF-2 and heparin into mice that had undergone bone marrow transplants. The Matrigel plugs were injected subcutaneously near the abdominal midline, where it solidified to form a hydrogel. The implants were removed seven days after injection and were examined to show CD34+ endothelial cells of donor origin had adhered to and incorporated in the implants. Murayama et al does not teach including angiogenic/vasculogenic factor VEGF or a bone marrow recruiting factor.

Naughton et al teach a method for inducing vasculogenesis comprising implanting a 3-D stromal tissue implant that secretes a growth factor, thereby acting as a drug delivery device. The implant can comprise a mesh housing, a biodegradable polymer is contained within the housing. Angiogenic and/or vasculogenic growth factors can be contained within the biodegradable polymer. The angiogenic and/or vasculogenic growth factors can include VEGF, HGF, FGF, EGF, TGF, PDGF, and combinations thereof. The implant can be comprised in a vascular prosthesis in the vascular system in the heart, including the myocardium. It is intended for use in humans. Naughton et al does not teach including a bone marrow recruiting factor.

Nova et al teaches that VEGF, PDGF, and interleukins such as IL-8 and IL-1a (which applicant calls bone marrow recruiting factors) all promote vascularization when coated or otherwise included in an implantable device.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to isolate progenitor cells, such as done by Murayama et al, substituting the Matrigel hydrogel with a 3-D stromal tissue implant device, such as taught by Naughton et al. One would have been motivated to use a more structured device such as that taught by Naughton et al in order to have more control over the placement of the implant, such as is required for use in humans. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use angiogenesis and vasculogenesis growth factors such as VEGF, PDGF, HGF, FGF and bone marrow recruiting factors such as IL-8, IL-1a and other comparable factors as the growth factors comprised in the implant. One would have been motivated to use a combination of these angiogenesis/vasculogenesis

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US04/15443

Supi	olemo	ental	Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

factors and bone marrow recruiting factors because they are taught to increase vasculogenesis around the implant.

Claims 1-43 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

Claims 8, 18-20, 25-26, 31-38, 41 and 43 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the method of isolating recruiting progenitor cells to a bodily site in a subject, wherein the bodily site is removed from the vasculature, the implant comprises a drug delivery system housed in non-biodegradable mesh housing, wherein the implant comprises a polyanhydride polymer, or wherein the polymer is poly -L-lactide, PLGA, a poly (fumaric acid:sebacic acid) or polycaprolactone, wherein the bone marrow recruiting factor is GM-SCF, wherein the progenitor cells are further isolated and cultured and reintroduced into the subject, wherein the progenitor cells are CD133+, or wherein the drug delivery system is prepared using phase inversion nanoencapsulation.